



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,727	07/31/2001	Stephen Ashcroft	6311-045	4322

21890 7590 10/10/2006

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
1585 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,727

Applicant(s)

ASHCROFT ET AL.

Examiner

Prieto B.

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed 7/06/06, claims 1, 19 and 31 have been amended; claims 1-31 remain pending and have been examined as set forth below.

2. There is a strong presumption that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present in the specification as filed, Wertheim, 541 F.2d at 262, 191 USPQ at 96; however, with respect to newly added or amended claims, applicant should show support in the original disclosure for the new or amended claims. See MPEP § 714.02, and 2163.06. ("Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure.") (see MPEP § 2163 B (II)). In this case, added and/or amended claimed limitation(s) will be interpreted in light of the specification.

3. Applicant's remarks and/or comments with regards to the substance of a telephonic interview as presented on page 10 seem to be inconsistent with recordation of the substance of the interview as mailed 7/18/06 for the telephonic interview conducted on July 6 2006 between examiner and applicant. The Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview is required to be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examiner during the interview because it bears directly on the question of patentability (see MPEP § 502.03 and § 713.04). Thus, the following rejection is not found to be conflicting with the substance of the above-mentioned interview as recorded on communication mailed 7/18/06.

Claim Rejection under 103

4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

5. Claims 1-17, 19-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 6,697,815) in view of Ryan et. al. (US 2002/0130899) (Ryan hereafter)

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 1, a “controller” servlet (204) receiving a request for a web page (col 5/lines 7-27) and invoking one of a plurality of handlers (210) associated with said requested web page (col 3/lines 64-col 4/line 12);

said plurality of “handlers” business program (210, col 6/lines 55-55) each performing a processing task associated with one of said plurality of web pages, including processing content required for said requested page (abstract, col 7/lines 55-61);

a handler associated with the one page generating output data “content” required for one web page (content col 8/lines 10-20, col 7/lines 55-67);

populating or storing in an UI model bean (206, col 6/lines 48-49) with said obtained content (col 7/lines 62-col 8/line 35, col 4/lines 13-15);

said controller invokes one of a plurality of “views” JSP (208, col 6/lines 50-52) for presenting said requested web page (col 8/lines 39-42), said view associated with one web page for receiving said content from said model bean (col 9/lines 26-34) and for presenting the one web page (col 8/lines 26-53, col 8/lines 43-44);

a view bean being accessed (invoked) a view associated with one web page for formatting “rendering” the one web page (step 260 of Fig. 2, col 8/lines 43-44);

wherein the “controller” servlet, plurality of handlers, the model bean, the plurality of views, a view bean reside on a server (col 6/lines 26-34); wherein the at least one model bean is constructed by a web server (col 7, lines 11-23 Fig. 2); although Wilson teaches that the business processes invoked by the controller retrieve content required from the web page, it does not explicitly teach where the handler invokes a bean for performing this retrieval;

Ryan teaches a data bean for retrieving data from the database [0014, 0106], a data access layer 106h performing data retrieval, said data layer comprising data beans (106f, 106e) [0115].

a combination of presentation beans, data beans, and business related (e.g. advertisement) beans to build pages that are delivered to the consumers, where business logic is incorporated into the beans (abstract), wherein the higher layer is capable of implementing business logic, the higher layer being on the lower layer. Specifically, a “layered content bean” comprising a first “higher” layer (e.g. a presentation/control layer) and a second “lower” layer (e.g. application/data access layer), wherein the first layer comprises business logic beans for retrieving respective information (e.g. advertisement bean) [0014], the first layer comprising

Art Unit: 2142

content related beans (e.g. presentation beans 108b) process business logic (rules both presentation and non-presentation or format related) [0130, presentation beans having business logic, see claim 46]. Thereby Ryan teaches a presentation layer that is capable of implementing business logic, where the presentation layer is on top of the application/data access layer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given Wilson teaching for retrieving content for building web pages, Ryan's teachings for building web pages would be readily apparent. Specifically, given Wilson's suggestion for separating program process as an invocable thread of a single daemon process. One would be motivated to combine the references teaches implementing business processes invoking data retrieval beans for retrieving content associated with a request, where business logic may be incorporated into a higher layer comprising the beans to allow the system to select content and displays based on the consumer, the consumer's product, network, geography, weather, co-brand, language, and locale, as suggested by Ryan (abstract) or the higher layer implementing *business rules that may include a non-presentation related rule* such as displaying wind chill when temperature is less than a certain specified temperature and displaying heat index when the temperature is more than a second temperature, as suggested by Ryan.

Regarding claim 2, said requested web page includes one parameter validated by a handler (Wilson: col 6/lines 3-14)

Regarding claim 3, wherein said request for said requested web page is subsequent to a link invocation "navigation" (Wilson: col 5/lines 7-50 validated by a handler col 5/lines 59-65).

Regarding claims 4, one of said plurality of handlers directs said controller to cause a different web page to be presented (i.e. handler corresponding to requested page Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61).

Regarding claim 5, one of said plurality of handlers directs said controller to invoke a different one of said plurality of views (bean/JSP) for presenting said requested web page (Wilson: col 8/lines 26-33).

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 6-8, one of said handlers renders the requested web page (Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61); wherein said controller presents the requested of web page generated (Wilson: step 262 of Fig. 2); wherein each of said plurality of handlers is multithreaded (i.e. multiple programs each comprising a thread Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61, col 3/lines 31-34).

Regarding claim 9, wherein one content bean receives content from a database, see Wilson: col 5/lines 55-59, see Ryan: retrieving data from the database [0014, 0106], a data access layer 106h performing data retrieval, said data layer comprising data beans [0115].

Regarding claim 10, wherein said database system has a first interface requiring a translation to access database via said interface [Ryan: 0014, 0106].

Regarding claim 11, content beans each having a function, which is “layered”, i.e. each provide a distinct structure business function logic, [Ryan: 0014, 0130].

Regarding claims 12-13, “configuration file” UI record model bean including a series “list” of data objects for said one web page for inclusion in said at least one of said plurality of web pages (Wilson: col 8/lines 10-16), and wherein said content bean receives said list of data objects to retrieve (Ryan: 0014, 0130), and wherein different pages are generated by modifying the beans (e.g. model bean/JSP) (Wilson: col 9/lines 26-34).

Regarding claim 14, authorization requirements for said requested web page satisfies said authorization requirements (e.g. valid credit card or adequate credit, Wilson: col 7/lines 47-54).

Regarding claim 15, views are multithreaded (i.e. multiple programs each comprising a thread Wilson: col 7/lines 55-61, col 3/lines 31-34).

Regarding claims 16-17, JSP technology views (bean/JSP) for presenting said requested web page (Wilson: col 8/lines 26-33) and view beans formats the one of pages (Wilson: col 8/lines 43-44) into HTML (col 4/lines 19-24, col 6/lines 50-52).

Art Unit: 2142

Regarding claim 19, this method claim comprises substantially the same functions discussed on the system claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 20-28, these method claims comprises are substantially the as discussed with respect to system claims 2-4, 9-14, respectively, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 29, rendering includes formatting said requested web page into HTML (Wilson: formatting col 8/lines 43-44 into HTML col 4/lines 19-24, col 6/lines 50-52).

6. Claims 18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Ryan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,272 Williams.

Regarding claims 18 and 30, however the above-mentioned prior art does not teach language translation with respect to the generation of a requested web page.

Williams teaches the use of EJB or bean based scripts associated with business processes for translating content in response to a web page request (col 12/lines 19-30, col 21/lines 9-50 and col 27/lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestion of Wilson for dynamically customized generating web pages in response to user request including invoking at least one view bean for rendering said requested web page, the teachings of Williams would be readily apparent. One would be motivated to include translation files generated to apply foreign language translation to multiple class files "model bean" storing database associated content in response to an HTTP base user request also rendering retrieved content according to the capabilities of ultra-thin client, as suggested by Williams extending Wilson's

Regarding claim 31, this system claim is substantially the same as claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable, limitation further includes, wherein a "controller" servlet (204) receiving a request for a web page (col 5/lines 7-27) and invoking one of a plurality of handlers (210) associated with said requested web page (col 3/lines 64-col 4/line 12); and said controller

Art Unit: 2142

invokes one of a plurality of “views” JSP (208, col 6/lines 50-52) for presenting said requested web page (col 8/lines 39-42), said view associated with one web page for receiving said content from said model bean (col 9/lines 26-34) and for presenting the one web page (col 8/lines 26-53, col 8/lines 43-44).

Response to Arguments

7. Regarding claims 1, 19 and 31, it is argued the applied prior art does not teach added limitation, namely, because the applied reference(s) do not teach wherein the at least one model bean is constructed by a web server.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, applicant’s interpretation of the applied prior art has been fully considered. According to instant invention, model bean 218 is constructed and populated with the data retrieved from the content system by content beans 215, where the function of model bean 218 is to hold the data that results from processing a web page request that is to be used to present the requested web page; the structure of model beans 218 is a Java class that is able to hold data elements inside, to ‘set’ these data elements to specific values, and then subsequently ‘get’ these values back out [see specs par 0061-0062].

Wilson teaches where the gateway servlet program running on a Web server of Fig. 2, the gateway servlet then instantiates a Java bean that has been designed for that particular data-set/object, and sets the data of that UI record into the bean (see summary); the gateway servlet 204 receives the information entered in the data fields by the user (hereinafter input data); the servlet instantiates a bean designed to process the input data as needed, populates the bean with the input data, the bean is a java bean class, wherein when populated by the servlet, a new instance of that bean is created; where each instance of that bean has different data (attributes) but the same processes (methods) (see Wilson column 7, lines 11-23).

8. All applicant’s arguments have been considered and not found persuasive.

9. Reply to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each rejected claim. If any claim stands allowed, the reply to a final rejection or

Art Unit: 2142

action must comply with any requirements or objections as to form (see 1.113). If prosecution in an application is closed, an applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e) prior to the earliest of: (c) A submission as used in this section includes, but is not limited to, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or drawings, new arguments, or new evidence in support of patentability. If reply to an Office action under 35 USC 132 is outstanding, the submission must meet the reply requirements of § 1.111 (see MPEP 706.07).

10. An amendment filed after final rejection is not entered as a matter of right and must be filed in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116 or 1.312, respectively (see MPEP 201). An amendment that will place the application either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be admitted. Amendments complying with objections or requirements as to form are to be permitted after final action in accordance with 37 CFR 1.116(a) (see MPEP 706.07(e)) may also be admitted. Except where an amendment merely cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, removes issues for appeal, or in some other way requires only a cursory review by the examiner, compliance with the requirement of a showing under 37 CFR 1.116(c) is expected in all amendments after final rejection (see MPEP 714.13). An amendment filed at any time after final rejection, but before an appeal brief is filed, may be entered upon or after filing of an appeal brief provided the total effect of the amendment is to (A) remove issues for appeal, and/or (B) adopt examiner suggestions (MPEP 714.13 see also MPEP § 1207 and § 1211).

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2142

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 to 2:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:
Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:

(571) 273-8300 (New Central Fax No.)
Or Telephone:
(571) 272-2100 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

B. Prieto
Primary Examiner
TC 2100
October 4, 2006

B. Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER